R9050-3

TAX FOUNDATION'S VOL. 30, NO. 2 FEBRUARY 1986

# TAX·FEATURES

## State-Local Property Taxes Up 8%; Wyoming and Alaska Lead the Pack

State and local property tax revenues rose 8.3 percent in fiscal year 1984, to $96.5 billion. This $7.3 billion increase, while slightly smaller in percentage terms, is of similar magnitude to the revenue gains amassed in the previous three years.

In contrast, the 1977-1980 figures showed an average yearly expansion of only 3.1 percent. This was largely attributable to the effects of California's Proposition 13 on overall totals, according to Tax Foundation economists. (In 1979, the first full year in which the limitation was in effect, it slashed California's property taxes by 45 percent, triggering a 2 percent decline in the national totals.) Since 1980 property taxes nationwide have grown by over 40 percent, an average rate of 8.9 percent a year.

Over the past ten years, property taxes more than doubled, rising by 102 percent from the $47.7 billion collected in 1974—an average annual rate of 7.3 per-

(Continued on page 4)

## 13¢ of Every Tax $1 Slated For Huge U.S. Health Bill

National health expenditures hit $355 billion in 1983. This was more than eight times what they were in 1965, according to Tax Foundation researchers.

Federal, state and local governments picked up $149 billion of the health-care tab, with 70 percent ($103 billion) of the total coming from Uncle Sam. State and local funds anted up the remaining $46 billion.

National health spending includes such items as patient care, medical research, and construction of medical facilities.

Since 1975, tax funds have provided about 42 cents of every dollar spent on the nation's sharply rising health bills. In 1965, taxes furnished only 26 cents. National health spending from all sources amounted to $1,459 per capita in 1983, compared to $211 in 1965. Health outlays claimed 10 8 percent of gross national product (GNP) in 1983 compared to 6 percent in 1965.

The Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) estimates that national health spending hit $420 billion in calendar year 1985, of which government's share was $180 billion—$128 billion for the Federal government and $52 billion for states and localities.

The numbers tell the story of how steadily Uncle Sam's involvement in health care has grown over the years. In 1983 private health care spending was about 7 times its 1965 level and state-local health spending was scarcely more than twice its previous size, but Federal spending was 19 times as large as it was in 1965. Health care costs today claim 13 cents of every government budget dollar, in contrast to 6 cents in 1965.

Medicare and Medicaid are the engines driving the sharp growth of government health costs. These two largest government health programs, enacted by Congress in 1965, now account for nearly two-thirds of all health-related government spending and for over one-quarter of the total health care bill for all Americans.

(Continued on page 2)

## THIS ISSUE:

PAGE 1
**State-Local Property Tax**
**U.S. Health Costs**

PAGE 3:
**Facts & Figures**
**"Front Burner"**

INSERT:
**Business Tax Burdens—Hi**
**Good Govt.**

### Per Capita State and Local Property Taxes

Number in parentheses indicates standing of states according to burden of state and local property tax. Dollars equals per capita property tax in fiscal year 1984. *(Tax Foundation map)*

*(U.S. HEALTH BILL, from page 1)*

Since 1965 Federal health spending has grown from 13 percent of the total from public and private funds to nearly 29 percent. State-local spending, in contrast, has remained at around 13 percent of the total throughout the period, according to researchers at the Tax Foundation.

**National Health Expenditures by Source of Funds and Type**

**Selected Calendar Years, 1965-1983[a]**

| Item | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1983 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount (millions) | | | | |
| Total expenditures | $41,749 | $74,984 | $132,673 | $248,013 | $355,400 |
| Private expenditures, total | 30,950 | 47,222 | 76,310 | 142,170 | 206,617 |
| Health services and supplies | 29,482 | 44,662 | 72,975 | 137,890 | 199,789 |
| Direct payments | 18,522 | 26,498 | 38,036 | 62,477 | 85,203 |
| Insurance premiums[b] | 9,993 | 16,871 | 33,178 | 72,468 | 110,482 |
| Other | 966 | 1,293 | 1,761 | 2,944 | 4,105 |
| Medical research | 176 | 215 | 264 | 313 | 354 |
| Medical facilities construction | 1,292 | 2,345 | 3,072 | 3,967 | 6,474 |
| Public expenditures, total | 10,799 | 27,762 | 56,363 | 105,843 | 148,783 |
| Health services and supplies | 8,754 | 24,922 | 51,297 | 98,200 | 140,349 |
| OASDHI (Medicare) | — | 7,496 | 16,317 | 36,819 | 58,828 |
| Temporary disability insurance[c] | 52 | 66 | 73 | 52 | 58 |
| Workers' compensation | 798 | 1,409 | 2,432 | 5,162 | 6,423 |
| Public assistance medical payments[d] | 2,112 | 6,321 | 15,098 | 28,111 | 37,187 |
| Department of Defense medical care | 853 | 1,782 | 2,830 | 4,207 | 6,589 |
| Maternal and child health programs | 255 | 429 | 589 | 810 | 1,016 |
| Public health activities | 814 | 1,420 | 3,157 | 7,711 | 11,226 |
| Veterans medical care | 1,145 | 1,764 | 3,495 | 5,941 | 7,660 |
| Medical vocational rehabilitation | 40 | 149 | 224 | 281 | 382 |
| State and local hospitals | 2,373 | 3,320 | 5,230 | 6,093 | 7,923 |
| Other[e] | 313 | 767 | 1,851 | 3,012 | 3,057 |
| Medical research | 1,340 | 1,754 | 3,071 | 5,110 | 5,809 |
| Medical facilities construction | 705 | 1,086 | 1,995 | 2,532 | 2,625 |
| | Percentage distribution | | | | |
| Total expenditures | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Private | 74.1 | 63.0 | 57.5 | 57.3 | 58.1 |
| Public | 25.9 | 37.0 | 42.5 | 42.7 | 41.9 |
| Federal | 13.3 | 23.6 | 28.0 | 28.7 | 28.9 |
| State-local | 12.6 | 13.4 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 13.0 |
| Exhibit: Total as percent of GNP | 6.0 | 7.6 | 8.6 | 9.4 | 10.8 |

[a]Data for 1983 are preliminary.
[b]Covers insurance benefits and amount retained by insurance companies for expenses, additions to reserves, and profits.
[c]Includes medical benefits paid under public law by private insurance carriers and self-insurers.
[d]After 1965, primarily Medicaid.
[e]Expenditures for Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration; Indian Health Service; school health and other programs.
Source: *Facts and Figures on Government Finance*, 1986, Tax Foundation (forthcoming); basic data from the Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration.


## Tax Features

*Tax Features* is published by the Tax Foundation, Incorporated. Original material is not copyrighted and may be reproduced. Please credit Tax Foundation, Incorporated.

Chairman of the Board ..... Hans W. Wanders
President ..... Robert C. Brown
Senior Vice President—
Program Planning and Tax Policy ..... Edward A. Sprague
Vice President—Research ..... Elsie M. Watters
Editor ..... William J. Wilson
Publications Manager ..... Sarah G. Wise

**Tax Foundation, Incorporated**
One Thomas Circle, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 822-9050


## MARK YOUR CALENDAR

National Taxpayers Conference
on Federal Affairs
May 5 & 6, 1986
L'Enfant Plaza Hotel • Washington, D.C.
Sessions on: *Living with Gramm-Rudman; Is Unitary Taxation on the Way Out?; Tax Reform Report.*
Special Feature: *The Capitol Steps.*
See March *Tax Features* for details.

Before Medicare and Medicaid, private funds covered about three-fourths of the national health bill. Today they cover less than 60 percent, and more than half of that is met from private insurance payments.

In 1983 Medicare provided benefits of $57 billion for almost twenty million of the thirty million people enrolled in the program, mostly those over 65. This came to approximately $2,900 per patient. (In 1985, Medicare benefits are estimated at $72 billion.) Since 1967, the first year in which Medicare was fully effective, costs of the program have spiraled at an annual growth rate averaging 17 percent, compared to a rate of 13 percent for all national health spending. HCFA projects that Medicare spending will continue to rise rapidly, although the pace will slow somewhat because of recent actions by Washington to reign in explosive spending increases coupled with an anticipated drop in medical inflation rates.

Medicaid, the second largest government health program, serves categories of low-income people. Medicaid served nearly 22 million persons in 1983, at an average cost of $1,500 each. It is financed on an approximately 50-50 basis by the Federal and state-local governments. Total Medicaid expenditures for the program came to $36 billion in 1983 and are estimated at $41 billion for 1985. Medicaid spending has increased at an annual rate of over 13 percent since 1973. Public assistance medical payments (largely under Medicaid) are now about 20 times as large as in 1965.

In addition to public policy changes, Tax Foundation economists cite a number of other factors that pushed health spending upward over the past two decades. These include the aging of the population; a growing population generally; inflation in medical care prices far higher than the general inflation rate; advances in medical technology; greater intensity of health services utilization; rising incomes that increase the affordability of services as compared to commodities; and a variety of other demand and supply factors.

Other large public programs providing health services include: general public health activities of state and local governments (costing $11.2 billion in 1983); state and local hospital care for the needy ($7.9 billion); veterans' medical care ($7.7. billion); and Department of Defense medical care ($6.6 billion).

Ninety-four percent of government spending for health goes for patient care. Medical research and the construction of medical facilities account for about 6 percent of the total, down from 18 percent in 1965.

The accompanying table gives complete breakdown for national health expenditures for select years since 1965.

TAX FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED
ONE THOMAS CIRCLE, N.W., SUITE 500

WASHINGTON, DC 20005
TELEPHONE (202) 822-9050

FEDERAL TAX POLICY MEMO

Editor: Edward A. Sprague, Vice President–Tax and Economic Affairs

FEBRUARY 1986

# Business Tax Burdens—II

Our August 1985 *Federal Tax Policy Memo* on business tax burdens showed a comparison of effective rates of tax for the overall corporate sector over the postwar period. Effective rates of Federal income tax declined from the 1960's onward reflecting the influence of tax relief provisions for business and timing factors. However, when state/local income taxes on corporations and the corporate share of payroll taxes are included in the calculation, the business tax burden rises, both absolutely and in proportion to total corporate profits.

**The total corporate tax burden often is not taken into account in public policy considerations. Certainly it wasn't in the formulation of the House tax reform bill last fall. The House Ways and Means Committee quite deliberately went about to impose both higher regular income taxes and a much tougher alternative minimum tax on the corporate sector.** A large part of the rationale for the latter was, in the words of the Ways and Means Committee report, "to restrict the ability of corporations to eliminate their tax liability." Reports of low or even negative effective rates of income tax on some corporations or industry sectors figured heavily in the process. The reported examples of corporate tax avoidance didn't have much to do with the overall corporate tax burden but were used to demonstrate the "unfairness" of the present system.

**The Ways and Means Committee report also emphasized a need "to restore the traditional balance of the income tax between individuals and corporations." This is a legitimate concern. But it's very difficult to judge just where that balance should be—quite aside from the fact that the real incidence of corporate taxes is always borne by individuals—as shareholders, employees, or customers—not impersonal corporate structures.**

What is the corporate "share" of the tax burden? Often it has been expressed by showing how small the Federal corporate income tax contribution to total budget receipts has become—only 9 percent in fiscal 1985 compared to around 30 percent in the 1950's. You see this comparison all the time. But it doesn't mean that much because during the same period Federal payroll taxes have grown so tremendously—from 12 percent to 36 percent of total receipts—which has diminished the importance of all income taxes in the budget picture.

If any comparison of this sort is to be made, it should be limited to income taxes themselves. And, yes, corporate income taxes also have shrunk as a share of total income taxes paid, but not as much and with some special factors affecting the most recent years.

As the table below indicates, there was a precipitous drop-off in corporate income tax receipts, both absolutely and as a percentage of total income taxes in fiscal 1982 and 1983. Corporate receipts fluctuate more widely than individual receipts anyway, and the severe recession of 1981-1982 had its maximum impact on revenues in fiscal 1982 and 1983. This was also the period when the Accelerated Cost Recovery System (ACRS) first took hold. More rapid depreciation, of course, helped depress tax collections initially, although this would tend to be made up in later years—a point consistently ignored in most effective rate analyses.

In the last two fiscal years, corporate income tax receipts jumped to an all-time high—$69.5 billion in fiscal 1985. In fiscal 1986, corporate receipts are expected to be about $76 billion and back up to the 1981 proportion of total income taxes. The revenue recovery coincided with better business conditions and, of course, the implementation of the 1982 and 1984 tax bills, which promptly took back a good part of the tax relief to business offered in 1981.

**Federal Corporate Income Tax Receipts**
**Selected Fiscal Years, 1950-1986**

| Year | $ Bils. | % of Total Income Tax Receipts |
|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 10.4 | 39.9 |
| 1955 | 17.9 | 38.3 |
| 1960 | 21.5 | 34.6 |
| 1965 | 25.5 | 34.3 |
| 1970 | 32.8 | 26.6 |
| 1971 | 26.8 | 23.7 |
| 1972 | 32.2 | 25.3 |
| 1973 | 36.2 | 25.9 |
| 1974 | 38.6 | 24.5 |
| 1975 | 40.6 | 24.9 |
| 1976 | 41.4 | 23.9 |
| 1977 | 54.9 | 25.8 |
| 1978 | 60.0 | 24.9 |
| 1979 | 65.7 | 23.2 |
| 1980 | 64.6 | 20.9 |
| 1981 | 61.1 | 17.6 |
| 1982 | 49.2 | 14.2 |
| 1983 | 37.0 | 11.4 |
| 1984 | 56.9 | 16.1 |
| 1985 | 69.5 | 17.3 |
| 1986e | 76.2 | 17.5 |

Sources: Economic Reports of The President.

## Corporate Profits and National Income

Critical factors in the "balance" of corporate versus individual taxes are both the level of corporate profits and their share of national income. How you measure corporate profits—with or without adjustments for inflation's impact on inventories and for capital consumption allowances—makes a difference, too. Including inventory and capital consumption adjustments, imperfect as they are, might make more sense for measuring "economic profits." But, for purposes of this exercise, it's more appropriate to exclude them because there is no comparable adjustment to employee compensation, the major element in the personal income component of national income and the individual income tax base.

In any event, corporate profits without these adjustments are now only barely above the level of five years ago, and the trend in corporate profits as a percentage of national income has been irregularly downward since the 1950's. (If the inventory and capital consumption adjustments are included, the trend would be the same only not quite as decisive.) In fact, the downtrend has closely paralleled that of corporate tax

*Material in* Federal Tax Policy Memo *may be reproduced freely. Credit to Tax Foundation, Incorporated, would be appreciated.*

receipts as a percent of total income taxes.

What, then, do you use as a base for "traditional balance" between corporate and individual taxes? 1960 is probably as good a year as any, when corporate taxes were 34.6 percent of the total and corporate profits, 11.7 percent of national income. This was before the capital recovery liberalizations started in 1961-1962 and before the tax rate cuts of 1964. Corporate profits as a percent of national income for the period 1960-1964 were quite stable, averaging, in fact, 11.8 percent.

**In any event, from 1960-1964 to 1985, the corporate profit share of national income dropped by 40 percent, while over virtually the same period, fiscal 1960 to fiscal 1986, corporate tax receipts as a percent of total income taxes dropped 49 percent. Viewed in these terms, we may be really quite close to the "traditional balance" of corporate and individual income tax burdens now despite all the special business tax provisions that some reformers love to rail about. None of this, of course, is an exoneration of the present corporate tax structure, faults of which have been well remarked, but it does certainly raise the question as to why we need to raise business taxes to restore a notion of balance. There is a lot more involved than just a simple proportional division of the current tax burden.**

* * * * * * * * *

**Total Corporate Profits**
**Selected Years, 1950-1985**

| Year | $ Bils. | % of Total National Income[1] |
|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 42.9 | 17.9 |
| 1955 | 49.2 | 14.6 |
| 1960 | 49.8 | 11.7 |
| 1965 | 77.4 | 13.2 |
| 1970 | 76.0 | 9.1 |
| 1971 | 87.3 | 9.7 |
| 1972 | 101.5 | 10.2 |
| 1973 | 127.2 | 11.3 |
| 1974 | 138.9 | 11.5 |
| 1975 | 134.8 | 10.4 |
| 1976 | 170.3 | 11.8 |
| 1977 | 200.4 | 12.4 |
| 1978 | 233.5 | 12.7 |
| 1979 | 257.2 | 12.6 |
| 1980 | 237.1 | 10.8 |
| 1981 | 226.5 | 9.3 |
| 1982 | 169.6 | 6.7 |
| 1983 | 205.0 | 7.5 |
| 1984 | 237.6 | 7.8 |
| 1985 | 227.6 | 7.1 |

[1]Reflects revisions to national income accounts as of December 1985.
Sources: Economic Reports of The President.

# The Good Government Solution

We have been hearing that the only solution to our budget deficit is a big raise in taxes and that the tax reform measure before the Senate should be the vehicle. These individuals may also call for further spending cuts and/or new nuisance taxes on alcohol or gasoline. But they claim the problem is too large to be handled by spending cuts or tax tinkering alone, and, since the income tax is still the "fairest" revenue source, it should bear the brunt of closing the deficit. The reform bill should be "revenue positive"—to raise $100 billion or so net—instead of revenue neutral. The base broadening ideas of the House, perhaps modified by the Senate, would be incorporated, but the rate reductions would be pared way back or even eliminated. What could be simpler?

Not too many politicians have embraced this wisdom publicly, at least as of this writing. There have been some hints, however. Last summer, in some comments that got little attention at the time, Dan Rostenkowski, the House Ways and Means Committee Chairman, opined: **"When we decide to raise large amounts of revenue to draw down the debt, let's have ready a new tax code that gives us the revenue base to do it without hitting anyone or any business unfairly. If the tax base is broad, a one or two percent hike in the rates can raise a lot of revenue without distorting the marketplace."**

This has a "good government" ring to it, as if out of a textbook on statecraft in public finance. Establish the "fairest" tax base possible, then set the tax rates at whatever level necessary to fund the budget.

**The problem is that it isn't anything like what really animated the tax reform effort in the first place. Rate reduction was the tonic that would encourage people and business interests to swallow the pill of base broadening.** Sure, it was supposed to lead to a more efficient, even-handed system, too, but it was the incentive of lower rates that would carry the day. In the President's program, this was honed to a sharp edge with a large majority of individual taxpayers scheduled for a net reduction in their income tax burden. It would seem very unlikely that the President, at least, could accept a revenue positive reform program without rate reduction or with only limited rate reduction.

Whatever the Administration or congressional attitude, a revenue positive reform plan loses some of its good government luster rather quickly when put in the context of actual tax policy. The reason taxpayers have clung so tenaciously to various deductions, exclusions, or exemptions is that they didn't trust the rate schedule or political commitments to keep it from rising. Despite ad hoc tax reductions, marginal income tax rates rose steadily higher and became more progressive through the end of the 1970's as inflation moved middle-income taxpayers up the bracket schedule.

Back in 1961, 90 percent of individual returns faced a marginal tax rate of no more than 20-22 percent (the first brackets at that time) with only 10 percent of returns above those rates. By 1979, about half of all returns were taxed at higher marginal rates than in 1961. About 30 percent were taxed at lower rates, mainly because the bottom rate was dropped to 14 percent in 1964. Elsewhere, the move up the bracket ladder was swift. At the 95th percentile, marginal rates increased sharply from 26 percent in 1961 to 38 percent by 1979.

The landmark 1981 Tax Act did cut marginal rates across the board and introduced inflation indexing. If the latter is retained, it will prevent inflationary bracket creep and help restore some confidence in the stability of the tax rate structure. **The 1984-85 tax reform consideration built on this incipient trust with the proposition that work and "economic" investment incentives really would be encouraged if we gave up some of our attachment to deductions, exclusions, exemptions, etc. If, on the other hand, we lose the latter and are rewarded only with tax reformers' sense of "fairness," it could strike a sour note indeed. Despite lofty calls for sacrifice to close the budget deficit gap, it may sound more like the old refrain, "tax and spend, tax and spend."** A separate tax increase on consumption or as a collection of nuisance taxes would not be easy either. But at least this would not break that commitment to a less damaging rate structure.

# Facts & Figures Paints U.S. Fiscal Portrait

A variegated picture of the tax, fiscal and economic environment emerges from sampling the latest edition of ***Facts and Figures on Government Finance***. This widely used handbook of public finance statistics offers the most comprehensive collection of data available on government taxes; spending; borrowing; costs of government programs and services; Federal, state and local tax rates; and social insurance costs; along with many important economic indicators.

The fully updated 23rd edition contains 283 statistical tabulations. Among highlights are:

• There are more than 82 thousand units of local government in the United States, including municipalities, townships and towns, school districts, and special districts. Nearly 66 thousand of them levy property taxes. Among states, Illinois has the most local jurisdictions, with nearly 6,500; Pennsylvania is next with close to 5,200 local units.

• Federal, state, and local government spending totaled $10 billion in 1929, less than 10 percent of gross national product (GNP). In calendar year 1984, governments spent nearly $1.3 trillion, or 34 percent of GNP; that was larger than the nation's total output as recently as 1972.

• At the turn of the century, local governments collected more in taxes than the Federal and state governments combined. It was not until World War II that Federal tax receipts exceeded combined state and local receipts. Today Federal taxes account for nearly two-thirds of all taxes; the local share is down to less than 13 percent.

• The population of the United States has grown by nearly 100 million in the last 40 years, while the number of households has increased by 50 million. At the

*(Continued on page 4)*

**"In calendar year 1984, governments spent nearly $1.3 trillion, or 34 percent of GNP."**

# THE FRONT BURNER

By Robert C. Brown
President
Tax Foundation, Incorporated

## *"High Noon"*

High noon is approaching, and everyone wants to play Gary Cooper. The Administration wants to be the good guy who slays the villain of runaway government spending. The Majority Party in the House wants to be the hero who forces a heartless president to accept defense cutbacks instead of "balancing the budget on the backs of the poor." The Majority Party in the Senate wants to be the great compromiser that drags the other two parties kicking and screaming to the bargaining table.

In fact, if the Washington power elite had their way, there would be no "bad guy" in this drama . . . just an orphaned deficit reduction measure, already repudiated by its putative parents, the U.S. Congress. The only problem is that the villainless melodrama won't wash—either as theatre or as lawmaking.

The Congress that is now screaming like a stuck pig as GRH threatens to bite hard is the same governing body that passed the bill 271 to 154 in the House and 61 to 31 in the Senate, a few short months ago. They passed GRH mostly because they lacked the political courage to reject it and expose themselves to the charge of being soft on spending. Now there are threats of a Coast Guard that can't put to sea and widows and orphans going to bed with empty stomachs. Hogwash. Such posturing serves neither the cause of fiscal responsibility nor the dignity of the U.S. Congress.

The first thing to keep in mind about GRH is that Congress voluntarily passed the legislation. No one held a gun to anyone's head. The only duress was a growing awareness that the voters were getting tired of the Members' inability to act like responsible adults in the area of spending controls.

The second thing to be aware of is that the full weight of GRH will land on the fiscal 1987 budget only if Congress does nothing to implement serious spending reductions before next October 5. Are the weeping and gnashing of teeth emanating from Capitol Hill signs that Congress has already conceded defeat? Having defined the boundaries of the playing field, are our lawmakers now complaining that the field is too small?

There are some who will argue that it is unfair to make Congress the "heavy" in this melodrama. After all, the President has insisted that defense cuts will not be straightjacketed to meet GRH targets. He has refused to allow Social Security to be included in the GRH stewpot. He has remained set in concrete in opposing tax increases.

True enough. But in the end, it must be conceded that the Constitution has placed responsibility at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Only Congress has the power to levy taxes. Only Congress has the power to enact spending legislation. Only Congress contrived and then passed GRH. The White House may propose. But only Congress can dispose. If the deficit reduction act is an evil spawn, we know who its parents are. There are more than enough black hats to go around as the GRH clock ticks relentlessly toward High Noon.

**"The first thing to keep in mind about GRH is that Congress voluntarily passed the legislation. No one held a gun to anyone's head."**

**"On a per capita basis for 1984, Wyoming (with collections of $1,100 per person) and Alaska ($873) far outdistanced any other state."**

*(STATE-LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES, from page 1)*

cent. Per capita property tax revenues grew by 81 percent, from $226 in 1974 to $408 in 1984. During the same period, property tax yields in relation to personal income dropped by 22 percent.

State-by-state per capita property taxes and rankings for 1984 appear on the map on page 1.

Other highlights:

• On a per capita basis for 1984, Wyoming (with collections of $1,100 per person) and Alaska ($873) far outdistanced any other state. The next highest states were New Jersey ($680), Connecticut ($668), New Hampshire ($666), and New York ($650). Alabama ranked lowest in per capita property tax collections ($111), followed by New Mexico ($148), Louisiana ($166), Arkansas ($170), Kentucky ($173), and Mississippi ($189).

• In terms of the decade's percentage growth in per capita property taxes, Alaska and Wyoming also headed the list, followed by the District of Columbia, South Carolina, and Virginia. Altogether, 25 of the 51 jurisdictions reported a doubling or better in per capita property taxes for the decade. None of the states experienced a property tax reduction.

## Currently Available

**"Working Paper" Series:** $3.00 each, Members/$5.00 each, Non-members—includes postage and handling. Order from Publications Department, Tax Foundation, Incorporated, (202) 822-9050.

"Business Tax Burdens/VAT After All? August 1985, 7p.
"Battle Over State-Local Tax Deductions/High-Income Tax Burdens-II," September 1985, 7p.
"Why Not Tax Amnesty?" September 1985, 5p.
"Tax Treatment of Retirement Savings," December 1985, 22p.
"Gramm-Rudman-Hollings: A Bad Idea Whose Time Has Come," December 1985, 8 p.
"The Uses of a Business Transfer Tax," December 1985, 7 p.
"The House Tax Bill," January, 1986, 15 p.

Summaries of some of these papers may appear as articles in *Tax Features* or in *Federal Tax Policy Memo*.

• Property taxes per $1,000 of state personal income were highest in Wyoming ($92), followed by Montana ($60), New Hampshire ($56), Oregon and Alaska ($53), and Michigan ($52). The lowest property tax burdens in relation to personal income were recorded for Alabama ($12), New Mexico, Delaware and Louisiana (all at $16), Kentucky and Oklahoma ($18), and Arkansas ($19).

• Only seven states and the District of Columbia showed any discernible growth in property taxes compared to personal income during the 1974-1984 period. They were: Alaska (up 64 percent), Wyoming (61 percent), the District of Columbia (33 percent), Michigan (10 percent), South Carolina (9 percent), Iowa (6 percent), and Utah and Oregon (1 percent).

The complete table entitled "Property Tax Collections by State, Per Capita and Per $1,000 of Personal Income for Fiscal Years 1974 and 1984" is available free of charge by contacting the Public Information Department of the Tax Foundation.

## Now Available

*Facts and Figures on Government Finance*—23rd Edition, is now on press and will be available shortly. Priced at $75 ($65 for members), the totally new looseleaf format includes quarterly updates of the statistical data contained in this widely used handbook of public finance. For details, or to order, contact Publications Department, Tax Foundation, Incorporated, One Thomas Circle, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20005. (202) 822-9050.

*(FACTS AND FIGURES, from page 3)*

same time, the number of persons occupying each household has dropped from 3.7 to 2.7.

• Per capita general expenditures of U.S. cities in 1983 ranged from an average of $396 in cities with population below 50,000 to $1,388 in cities with 1,000,000 or more.

• The 49 largest cities raised $762 per capita in general revenues from their own sources in 1983. Property taxes brought in $226; general sales taxes, $90; and income taxes, $109—all on a per capita basis.

**TAX FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED**
One Thomas Circle, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
**PAID**
Washington, D.C.
Permit No. 1287

Ms. Jeanne Long
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, INC.
4500 East-West Highway
Bethesda, Maryland 20814